

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 93 09:37:30 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #202
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 12 Feb 93 Volume 93 : Issue 202

Today's Topics:

 2M Repeater Freq. Wanted.
 900 Mhz Rabbit VCR extenders
 Calling Anthony Q. (CQ Hawaii)
 Calling Tony Querbin (CQ Hawaii)
 CW Keys and Keyers
 FCC inquiry on scanner manufacture/cellular freq. ban
 Home building PTOs
 HTX-100 (2 msgs)
 Is used ham gear overpriced?
 Kenwood TS-820 HF rig
 Mobile rig in Camry-Hazardous to Your \$
 Motorola SecureClear(tm) Cordless Phones
 multiple licenses
 Need help on prgming Mostar rom
 Opinions on 2M mobiles?
 QSL Routes Wanted
 Swap Nets around the country?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 12 Feb 93 16:11:23 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!rpi!rs6415.ecs.rpi.edu!maessm@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2M Repeater Freq. Wanted.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <93043.020709AXH113@psuvm.psu.edu>, Azmi Hashim <AXH113@psuvm.psu.edu>

writes:

|> I will be travelling to Troy, NY from State College PA. I need some
|> freq, especially with phone patch feature around Troy, or somewhere
|> along the way. I'll be using Highway 15, I-390, and I-90.

146.82 - W2SZ/R this is the repeater of the RPI amateur radio club.
It is located at the highest point in Troy.

--

Mat Maessen N2NJZ | maessm@rpi.edu

-----+-----
The opinions expressed in this message definitely do NOT reflect the
views of RPI, Roland Schmitt, or BAPP

(c) 1993 Fake-sig Co., Inc.

Date: 12 Feb 93 16:27:19 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 900 Mhz Rabbit VCR extenders
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Has anyone considered or tried using a Rabbit to transmit
asynchronous digital data? It seems to me that it might be possible
to modulate that either directly (through a clipping and levelling
circuit) from an RS-232 source, or from the output of a network
card...

\\/ ^ ^	Ben Mehlman Trirex Systems Inc	Indigo..
# # @	bmehlman@trirex.com	Indigoing..
___/ -----	>NeXTMail Welcome<	Indigone.

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 93 16:19:42 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!The-
Star.honeywell.com!umn.edu!csus.edu!csusac!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Calling Anthony Q. (CQ Hawaii)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Tony, please drop me a note. Lost your e-mail address. Thanks. :-)

chuckb@babbage.ecs.csus.edu
n6dbt

--

My sig file

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 93 16:01:57 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!The-
Star.honeywell.com!umn.edu!csus.edu!csusac!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Calling Tony Querbin (CQ Hawaii)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Tony, drop me a note please. Have a question(s) for you.

73s :-)

chuckb@babbage.ecs.csus.edu
n6dbt

--

My sig file

Date: 12 Feb 93 15:56:55 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: CW Keys and Keyers
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Today is my day for questions to the net!! :-)

I am looking for recommendations and sources for a good first key for CW operations. I sortof would like to start off with a straight key so that I can get that feel of sending "real" CW.

I understand that there are straight key kits available, but, I haven't found a source for such a beast. Any ideas??

Finally, if you were to go out and buy an automatic keyer which one would you buy and what features would make it or break it??

Thanks again for all the assistance
- Warren (KD4???)

Warren E. Lewis
Graphics Division
SAS Institute Inc.
Cary, NC

saswel@unx.sas.com
(919) 677-8001 x6542
PP-ASEL
DOD#0021

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 93 16:44:13 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: FCC inquiry on scanner manufacture/cellular freq. ban
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I pulled this from another newsgroup. I think all hams should review this very carefully for possible impact on equipment we take for granted. Especially transverters that might be available today for 900MHz work. Seems to me a 900MHz transverter might be very easily modified to provide cellular coverage (if the transverter didn't already have a broad enough receive capability anyway) and, therefore, might become unavailable in the future.

Anyway.....

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1993 05:10:24 GMT

-----NOTICE-----

This information is provided as a public service by the:

Internet Federal Register Project of Counterpoint Publishing
and The Internet Company (internet.com).

For more information on the availability of this data, please send mail to:

fedreg-info@internet.com

Redistribution of this information is unlimited as long as this notice is included and not modified in any fashion.

47 CFR Parts 2 and 15

[ET Docket No. 93-1; FCC 93-1]

Radio Scanners That Receive Cellular Telephone Transmissions

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This Notice of Proposed Rule Making proposes to deny equipment authorization to radio scanners capable of receiving transmissions in the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service. This action is taken in response to the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act (Pub. L. 102-556). The intended effect of this action is to help ensure the privacy of cellular telephone conversations.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before February 22, 1993, and reply comments on or before March 8, 1993.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Wilson, Office of Engineering and Technology, (202) 653-8138.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making in ET Docket No. 93-1, FCC 93- 1, adopted January 4, 1993, and released January 13, 1993. The full text of this decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (room 230), 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision also may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Downtown Copy Center, at (202) 659-8657 or 1990 M Street, NW., suite 640, Washington, DC 20036.

Paperwork Reduction

The following collection of information contained in this proposed rule has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review under section 3504(h) of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3504(h)). Copies of this submission may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Downtown Copy Center, at (202) 659-8657 or 1990 M Street, NW., suite 640, Washington, DC 20036. Persons wishing to comment on this collection of information should direct their comments to Mr. Jonas Neihardt, Office of Management and Budget, room 3235 NEOB, Washington, DC 20554, (202) 395-4814. A copy of any comments filed with the Office of Management and Budget should also be sent to the following address at the Federal Communications Commission: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Managing Director, Paperwork Reduction Project, Washington, DC 20554. For further information contact Ms. Judy Boley, (202) 632-7513.

OMB Number: None.

Title: Scanning Receiver Compliance Exhibit.

Respondents: Businesses or other for profit, small businesses/organizations

Action: New collection.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting.

Estimated Annual Burden:

Number of respondents: 40.

Annual hours per respondent: 0.25.

Total annual burden: 10.

Needs and Uses: An exhibit accompanying a Form 731 Application for Equipment Authorization will determine compliance of applicants requesting authorization to market scanning receivers and frequency converters with Congressionally mandated regulations. The regulations prohibit the marketing of radio scanners capable of intercepting, or being modified to intercept, cellular telephone conversations.

Summary of the Notice of Proposed Rule Making:

1. By this action, the Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR parts 2 and 15 to prohibit the manufacture or importation of radio scanners capable of receiving frequencies allocated to the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service. This action is in response to the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act (Act), Pub. L. 102-556.

2. The Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service ("Cellular Radio Service") provides telephone service to mobile customers. Cellular telephones use frequencies in the bands 824-849 MHz and 869-894 MHz to connect their users to other cellular system users and to the Public Switched Telephone Network.

3. As defined in 47 CFR part 15 scanning receivers, or "scanners," are radio receivers that automatically switch between four or more frequencies anywhere within the 30-960 MHz band. In order to control their potential to cause harmful interference to authorized radio communications, the rules require that scanners receive an equipment authorization (certification) from the Commission prior to marketing.

4. In the past five years, 22 different models of scanning receivers capable of receiving cellular telephone transmissions have been issued grants of equipment authorization. During this same period, ten other models capable of tuning frequencies between 806 and 900 MHz except for the cellular bands have also been authorized. Several publications currently on the market describe relatively simple modifications that users can make to many of the latter scanning receivers to enable that equipment to receive cellular telephone transmissions.

5. The Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act requires that the Commission, by April 26, 1993, prescribe and make effective regulations denying equipment authorization for any scanning receiver capable of:

Receiving transmissions in the frequencies allocated to the domestic cellular radio service,

Readily being altered by the user to receive transmissions in such frequencies, or

Being equipped with decoders that convert digital cellular transmissions to analog voice audio.

The Act also stipulates that, beginning one year after the effective date of the regulations adopted to satisfy the above requirements, no receiver having the above capabilities shall be manufactured in the United States or imported for use in the United States.

6. In accordance with the Act, we are proposing to deny equipment authorization to scanning receivers that tune frequencies used by cellular telephones. We are also proposing to require applicants for the authorization of scanning receivers to include in their applications a statement declaring that their receivers cannot be tuned to receive cellular telephone transmissions.

7. Also in accordance with the Act, we are proposing to require that scanning receivers be incapable of being readily altered by the user to operate within the cellular bands. To assist us in determining whether a scanner complies with this requirement, we propose to require applicants for scanning receiver equipment authorization to include in their applications a statement pledging that their receivers cannot be readily altered to receive cellular telephone transmissions. We also propose to prohibit the authorization of any scanning receiver for which cellular coverage can be readily restored by the user. We solicit comment on this proposed reporting requirement and on the definition of "readily altered." We also seek comment on whether additional information, such as why the receiver cannot be readily altered, should be required.

8. In further compliance with the Act, we propose to deny equipment authorization to any scanning receiver that can be equipped with decoders that convert digital cellular transmissions to analog voice audio. We invite comment on the potential impact of this requirement on existing models of scanning receivers.

9. There currently are a number of frequency converters on the market that can be used in conjunction with scanners that receive frequencies below 800 MHz to enable the reception of cellular

telephone transmissions. We are proposing to deny equipment authorization to converters that tune, or can be readily altered by the user to tune, cellular telephone frequencies. We will require that applicants for FCC equipment authorization of frequency converters used with scanners include in their applications a statement pledging that the converters cannot be easily altered to enable a scanner to receive cellular transmissions. We seek comment on whether this statement should also include evidence indicating why the converter cannot be easily modified.

10. The Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is contained in the text of the Notice.

11. Comment Dates

Pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before February 22, 1993, and reply comments on or before March 8, 1993. In order to comply with the requirement of the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act that FCC rules be promulgated within 180 days of enactment, we will proceed with this Notice without furnishing a prior text as provided by Article 607 of the United States-Canada Free-Trade Implementation Act of 1988 (Pub. L. 100-499, 102 Stat. 1851). To do so would frustrate achievement of a legitimate domestic objective. In addition, the Commission is not likely to be able to accommodate requests for extension of the comment periods. To file formally in this proceeding, you must file an original and five copies of all comments, reply comments, and supporting comments. If you want each Commissioner to receive a copy of your comments, you must file an original plus nine copies. You should send comments and reply comments to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during normal business hours in the Dockets Reference Room of the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20554.

12. Ex-Parte Rules-Non-Restricted Proceeding

This is a non-restricted notice and comment rule making proceeding. Ex parte presentations are permitted, except during the Sunshine Agenda period, provided they are disclosed as provided in Commission rules. See generally 47 CFR 1.1202, 1.1203 and 1.1206(a).

13. For further information on this proceeding contact David Wilson, Technical Standards Branch, Office of Engineering and Technology, 202-653-8138.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Parts 2 and 15:

Communications equipment, Wiretapping and electronic surveillance.

Federal Communications Commission.

Donna R. Searcy,
Secretary.

Parts 2 and 15 of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations are proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 2-FREQUENCY ALLOCATIONS AND RADIO TREATY MATTERS; GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 2 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 4, 302, 303 and 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154, 154(i), 302, 303, 303(r) and 307.

2. Section 2.975 is amended by adding a new paragraph (a)(8) to read as follows:

2.975 Application for notification.

(a) * * *

(8) Applications for the notification of receivers contained in frequency converters used with scanning receivers shall be accompanied by an exhibit indicating compliance with the provisions of 15.121 of this chapter.

* * * * *

3. Section 2.1033 is amended by adding a new paragraph (b)(12) to read as follows:

2.1033 Application for certification.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(12) Applications for the certification of scanning receivers under part 15 shall be accompanied by an exhibit indicating compliance with the provisions of 15.122 of this chapter.

* * * * *

PART 15-RADIO FREQUENCY DEVICES

1. The authority citation for part 15 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 4, 302, 303 and 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154, 302, 303 and 307.

2. Section 15.37 is amended by adding a last sentence to paragraph (b), and adding a new paragraph (f), to read as follows:

15.37 Transition provisions for compliance with the rules.

* * * * *

(b) * * * In addition, receivers are subject to the provisions in paragraph (f) of this section.

* * * * *

(f) The manufacture or importation of scanning receivers, and frequency converters used with scanning receivers, that do not comply with the provisions of 15.121 shall cease on or before April 26, 1994. Effective April 26, 1993, the Commission will not accept applications for equipment authorization for receivers that do not comply with the provisions of 15.121. This paragraph does not prohibit the sale or use of authorized receivers manufactured in the United States, or imported into the United States, prior to April 26, 1994.

3. Section 15.121 is added to read as follows:

15.121 Scanning receivers and frequency converters used with scanning receivers.

Scanning receivers, and frequency converters used with scanning receivers, must be incapable of operating (tuning), or readily being altered by the user to operate, within the frequency bands allocated to the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service. Receivers capable of "readily being altered by the user" include, but are not limited to, those for which the ability to receive transmissions in the restricted bands can be added by clipping the leads of, or installing, a diode, resistor and/or jumper wire; or replacing a plug-in semiconductor chip. Scanning receivers, and frequency converters used with scanning receivers, must also be incapable of converting digital cellular transmissions to analog voice audio.

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1993 21:42:30 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!mbutts!mbutts@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Home building PTOs
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

My Drake R4C/T4XC and Ten-Tec 2510 all have PTOs with direct leadscrew mechanical tuning and linear 500 kHz bandspreads. Perhaps their coils are artfully wound.

73 de KC7IT

— —

Mike Butts mbutts@qcktrn.com Research Engineering Mgr. 503-685-1302
Quickturn Systems, Inc., 8005 SW Boeckman Road, Wilsonville, Oregon 97070
My opinions are my own, and aren't necessarily shared by Quickturn Systems.

Date: 11 Feb 93 14:57:02 MST
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!hellgate.utah.edu!
sunset.cs.utah.edu!bentley@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: HTX-100
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

```
: For the record, I own an HTX-100 - it's primary use has been a full-time 10m
: packet rig..which it does quite nicely at, no complaints.
```

So what kind of stuff do you do with packet? Did you send this message ??
Isn't it easier to use a modem and call the local university to get net access?

I don't mean to sound critical, I guess i'm just curious.

And another guy wrote:

The HTX-100 that I have I use mostly for receiving the RS-12/13 satellite and it does a excellent job!

So what kind of stuff can you get from a satellite? Sounds fun! I would like to talk to the Russian Cosmonauts on VHF if I could, but I have only a wimpy little HT.

Adam

```

                                     /  '- ' /
It's Only Rock'n'Roll but  I like it!  | [= == | | | | | | | | | | [: : }
e-mail: bentley@cs.utah.edu              \__.-.-\

```

Date: 12 Feb 93 17:17:24 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: HTX-100
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Do they show any signs of dropping the price of the HTX-202?

72/73 Kevin, N7WIM / G8UDP

a-kevinp@microsoft.com

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1993 15:37:16 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!cbfsb!cbnews!cbnewsm!jeffj@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Is used ham gear overpriced?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <109021@netnews.upenn.edu> yee@mipg.upenn.edu (Conway Yee) writes:

>I am currently in the market for an HT and have been shopping around
>both the new and used equipment. I notice that the going price for
>used gear is on the order of 80% (or so) of the new price. While I
>agree that this should be the price if this is all the market can
>bear, I question whether it is a bit overpriced. The risk in purchasing
>used gear is a bit higher than new.

>
>After shopping around, I have pretty much resigned myself to having to
>buy my HT new. I would prefer a discontinued ICOM 32AT but the going
>rate is too high for my tastes. The difference between the used 32AT
>and a new rig isn't all that much.

Interesting, out here in California when I listen to the swapnets on
2 meters and 40 meters I have been noticing the price of used 2 meter
gear dropping. Might be the economy but also a function of more gear
being available. I hear a used DJ-160 go for \$135 with lot's of extras.
while that was a little low price it seems I always hear HT's going for
around \$170 every time.

>I am not sure about the market for used HF gear but since there is much
>more of it out there, I suspect that it is more reasonable. I purchased
>my used Yaesu 101B for a couple hundred dollars where the price of a
>modern rig is well over \$1k.

>
>Comments anyone?

You can usually find used tube HF gear going for \$250-\$300. My Swan
was \$300 and has worked simply great since I got it.

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB		Nickel Back: What you get when you ask free
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com		agents to give you a million
Infolinc BBS 415-778-5929		dollars worth of effort.

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1993 15:32:47 GMT

From: yuma!gw214790@purdue.edu
Subject: Kenwood TS-820 HF rig
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <199302101521.AA06072@cardamom.unx.sas.com> saswel@unx.sas.COM (Warren E. Lewis) writes:

>I have the opportunity to purchase a Kenwood TS-820 HF rig
>and I was wondering if anyone on the net had experience with
>a rig of this type or has some first hand knowledge of its
>advantages and disadvantages? Also what do you think would
>be a fair price to pay for such a rig??
> Thanks and 73s - Warren (KD4???)

I have a TS-820S with the digital readout and I love it. You do have to retune when you change frequency more than about 100kHz, but it has tubes, and they take a beating and still give me 120 watts. I retuned the drive and receive coils and that really helped the sensitivity, as it had been tuned for CW and I don't use that much.

I consistantly get great reports on my audio. I am using a Shure SM-58 thru a transformer and I monitor my audio on headphones (it has a MON switch). I just started using it for SSTV and I am in the process of building a 6m transverter (it has transverter in/out jacks). I built my own 12v converter (uses AC normally) from the schematic in the service manual and I've taken it camping (it keeps the tent warm!!!).

I am currently doing the WARC band conversion in Feb '83 QST, but the having 17m in the AUX position doesn't put enough inductance in the final circuit and I am figuring out how to use a relay to switch more inductance in when I'm in AUX. I am not doing the 30m convert, I want to use the WWV/JJY position for 12m.

All in all, I love the rig. No memories (save my brain), but a great noise blanker and I only paid \$350, no CW filter (notr that I need it).

To Warren, Congratulations on the new call (when you get it!).

73,
Galen, KF0YJ, often on 14.180 about 04:00 UTC.

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1993 16:17:19 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Mobile rig in Camry-Hazardous to Your \$
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <86754@ut-emx.uucp> miles@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Miles Abernathy)

writes:

> There was a published(?) report a few months ago of the ham owner of a
> new 92 Camry, who had a ham rig installed. First time she transmitted,
> the ignition computer fried. Replacement cost \$1100+. Not a warranty
> item, due to a warning in the owner's and / or service manual about the
> use of transmitting equipment. I believe that is where the thread
started.

I've heard about this happening but still don't understand how a transmitter can destroy a computer. I assume that means some component was physically damaged. I know RF can screw up a computer...it does so to my PC with frustrating regularity...but a reset always clears it up. Perhaps people are being charged these outrageous amounts for a simple reset?

Yes. I know car computers can be destroyed by other means but here the implication is that it's the RF from the transmitter that does it.

Comments??

Mark AA7TA

Date: 12 Feb 93 11:04:27 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Motorola SecureClear(tm) Cordless Phones

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb11.220533.4194@oakhill.sps.mot.com> hunter@oakhill.sps.mot.com
(Hunter Scales) writes:

>

> Hi guys:

> I have just purchased a Motorola SecureClear cordless phone
> with the belief that it will "scramble" the audio between the
> handset and base unit. Someone else has told me that the
> technique used is "audio inversion" and that, far from being
> secure, it is relatively easy and cheap to defeat. Could
> someone tell me exactly what "audio inversion" is and how
> it would be descrambled? Is this no better than you garden
> variety Cobra phone? Thanks.

Audio inversion is just what it sounds like, the frequency order of the audio is reversed. IE the lows become highs and the highs become lows. You get this exact effect when you listen to a lower sideband transmission with your receiver set to upper sideband. In fact, this is one method of doing audio inversion. It offers some security, but some people can understand inverted audio speech, and the equipment to re-invert the audio is relatively simple. Another Motorola

SecureClear phone will receive it perfectly, there is no "code"
so every unit will decode the "encryption" of every other unit.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1993 16:09:16 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: multiple licenses
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <86748@ut-emx.uucp> oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu (Derek Wills)
writes:

> ...
> Unless you go straight from nothing to Extra class, you get one or
> more intermediate licenses and (if you want to) several different
> callsigns. Each license is good for 10 yrs and I don't see anything
> that says that your earlier license expires when you upgrade. It may
> be in the small print somewhere, and there are few occasions when you
> would want to use more than one of your callsigns.
> ...

Well, I'd guess that once the FCC database is updated with your new
callsign info, the older license(s) technically no longer exist. Also, the
callsign actually is assigned to the station, not the person. The person
is authorized to operate based on the class of the operator's license (I'm
not sure what that has to do with this discussion, tho :-).

My 2 cents worth....

73... Mark AA7TA (formerly N7PMQ and KG7JL)

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1993 14:35:19 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!The-
Star.honeywell.com!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!mont@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Need help on prgming Mostar rom
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am posting this for a friend who does not have access to the
newsgroup.

Please send or cc all replies to: williamg@scrvm2.vnet.ibm.com

Return-Path: <WILLIAMG@SCRVM2.VNET.IBM.COM>

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 93 10:53:59 PST

From: "George T. Williams Jr." <WILLIAMG@SCRVM2.VNET.IBM.COM>

Subject: Need info to prgm Mostar rom

I need some information which would allow me to program my own
EEPROM for my Motorola Mostar radio. I am able to dump the contents
of the EEPROM but unable to decode it.

The radio is using a XICOR 2804A (512x8) as the EEPROM. It is also
only using the lower for bits of the EEPROM for the processor.

I would like to be able to program my radio at will in the HAM band
and also be able to change the PL code or type.

Thank you for your time.

Please send any information via EMAIL to
Williamg@scrvm2.vnet.ibm.com

73 de N6NKT

--
Mont Pierce

Ham Call: KM6WT	Internet: mont@netcom.com
bands: 80/40/20/2	IBM vnet: mont@vnet.ibm.com
modes: cw,ssb,fm	
qth: Fremont, CA	Religion: Jehovah's Witnesses 9/72

Date: 10 Feb 93 16:48:36 GMT

From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!usenet@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Opinions on 2M mobiles?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Greetigs all...

I'm in the market for a 2M mobile rig. I'm considering the Yaesu FT-2400

or the Icom IC-229. Does anyone have any strong opinions (facts also accepted) one way or the other? I'm especially concerned about the intermod tendencies.

Any info will be appreciated.

Thanks and 73.. Mark AA7TA

Date: 12 Feb 93 15:38:58 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!gatech!swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!
usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: QSL Routes Wanted
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <BAT.93Feb10142332@gdstech.GRUMMAN.COM> bat@gdstech.GRUMMAN.COM (Pat Masterson) writes:

> YN1CC is to PO Box 2971, Managua, Nicaragua.

^^^^ has a States-side QSL Manager. Check the GO list.

Rajiv
aa9ch
r-dewan@nwu.edu

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1993 21:25:38 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!cbfsb!cbnews!cbnewsm!jeffj@ames.arpa
Subject: Swap Nets around the country?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I received some email asking about a swapnet locally around here. Brought a question to mind, what are times and frequencies for swap nets on the air around the US and around the world? There is the West Coast Swap Net here in California at noon Saturdays on 7.240. Also there is a swap net on 147.195 (PL100+) on Tuesday nights at 7:30-8:00pm here in the San Francisco bay area. When I was up in Seattle I heard a killer swap net on 145.33 on Saturday mornings that had the whole Evergreen net linked into it. Any others around the US or the world? 73!

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB		Nickel Back: What you get when you ask free
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com		agents to give you a million
Infolinc BBS 415-778-5929		dollars worth of effort.

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #202
